

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE British States Patient and Trademark Office Advise COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PD Box 149 Namedia Virgine 2233-1459

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	PERST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/963,472	09/27/2001	Darsake Okamura	KP-9010	9140
YOUNG & THOMPSON 745 SOUTH 23RD STREET 2ND FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22202			EXAMINER EASHOO, MARK ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	

DATE MAILED: 01/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Application No. 09/963,472	Applicant(s) OKAMURA ET AL.	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Mark Eashoo, Ph.D.	1732	
Period t	for Reply	communicati	on appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address
	red patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR	e months after the 1.704(b)	mailing date of this communication, even if to	(30) days will be considered limely. I'vis from the making dub of this communication, MDDNED (35 U.S.C.) § 133, MDDNED (35 U.S.C.) and, MDDNED (35 U.S.C.) and, MDDNED (35 U.S.C.) and
	This action is FINAL.	2b)⊠	This action is non-final	
		ndition for at	lowance except for formal matte der Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	rs, prosecution as to the merits is
Disposit	ion of Claims			11, 400 0.0. 210.
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-9,13-16 is/are per	ding in the a	polication	
	4a) Of the above claim(s)	is/are with	drawn from consideration	
5)[_]	Claim(s) is/are allowed	d.		
6)[⊠	Claim(s) 1-9 and 13-16 is/are Claim(s) is/are objecte	rejected.		

 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 27 September 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some c) None of
 - Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.
 - Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application)
 - since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)	
1) Moffice of References Cited (PTO-882) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Minformation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ale.	4) Inferview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6) Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without written traverse of claim group I, claims I-9 and I3-I6 in the papers filed 27-007-2003 is acknowledged.

Claims 10-12 and 17-20 from non-elected claim group II have been canceled by the amendment filed 27-007-2003.

Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statements filed 27-SEP-2008 and 22-499-2002 comply with the provisions of 27 CER 157.158 and MFEP 8-009. Accordingly, they have been placed in the application file and the information referred to therein has been considered as to the merits.

Specification

A substitute specification excluding the claims is required porsuant to 37 EFR (125(a) because of numerous grammatical envers which makes comprehension by a reader difficult. For example:

- Page I. lines 7-8, recites "a method of recycling moild plastic parts". This appears to intend "a method of recycling moilded plastic parts". This error occurs throughout the entire specification.
- Pege I, lines 18-19 recites "Accordingly, they have ever been formed of a compaction of thermoplastic resins."
 This appears to intend "Accordingly, they have always been formed from thermoplastic resins."
 - Page 2. line I, recites the words "decreasing the cost," which appears to mean the phrase "lower cost".

Application/Control Number: 89/963,472 Art Heit-1722

4.) Page 2 lines 14-15 recites "Mot only such physical defects also chemical substances cause the leaf nilusence on the photographic characteristics." This appears to intend "Not only such physical defects, but when chemical substances also cause the had influence on the photographic characteristics."

The above list is not a complete list of all the grammatical errors. It is requested that Applicant review the entire specification for other grammatical errors.

A substitute specification filed under 37 GPL LOS(s) must only contain subject matter from the original specification and any previously entered amendment under 37 GPL LOS (it the substitute specification contains additional subject matter not of record, the substitute specification must be filed under 37 GPL LOS(s) and (c)

A substitute specification in proper informatic English and in compliance with 37 CFR 152(a) and (b) is required. The substitute specification filled must be accompanied by a statement that it contains no new matter

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. (12)

The specification shall cecelede with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention

Claims I-S and IS-IS are rejected under 35 U.S.C. III.2, second paragraph, as being indefinite for falling to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Specifically, claim I recites the phrase "A nethod of used recycling mode plastic parts" which is indefinite because of unclear grammur. For the purpose of further examination, this phrase has been interpreted as — A method of recycling used model plastic parts —.

Throughout claims 1-9 and 13-16 the phrase "used mode plantic parts" is repeated which causes the claims to be indefinite because of unclose grammar. For the purpose of further examination, this phrase has been interpreted as — used models plantic parts —.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC 8 103

The following as a questation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office

(a) A patter may not be admitted though the investion is not abstractly disclassed as described as set forth in section (IC) of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sneght to be patented and the price art are sects that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the investion are made to a person having ordersy still in the art to which said subject matter, person in which it is restricted over made.

The application convently amenic print inventors. In considering potentiability of the claims under 35 til 50, 105(d), the committee presumes that the subject metter of the vertices alone was commonly exerced at the time any inventors covered therein were made absent any evidence to the continut, Applicant is subvised of the obligation under 37 CPR LSS to print and the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a least inventor was made in under for the assentior to consider the applicability of SS LSS. 103(c) and potential SS LSS. 102(c), (i) or (a) print and enter SS LSS. 103(c) and potential SS LSS. 102(c), (ii) or (a) print and enter SS LSS. 103(c).

Claims I and 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over VanDeMoero et al. (US Pat. S.600, 380) in view of Akap (US Pat. S.851,743).

Reparting claim 1: VanileMorre et al. teaches the basic claimed process of recycling used and moded consumer products (245-50 and (25-45), comprising, power-tring /crushing the used consumer product (0.85-55), using the crushed/power-teel material as a modifying material (in recycling) (0.85-55), and mailing recycled pletic parts (0.85-56).

Vasiblems et al. dess not truch adding carbon block and an anticuldant to a molding material. Neutribeless: Also tracket adding carbon black and an anticuldant to a molding material (82-48 and 85-58-925). Vasibalisms et al. and Also: are combenable because they are concurred with a similar trachmical difficulty, neunely, moldingly producing for photosentibre products. At the time of invention a person bening ordinary skill in the art would be found it devices to have added carbon block and an anticoloist to a molding material, as taught by Alson. In the process of Nandelstern et al. Since Also supports the use of carbon black as a desired payment and the use of anticoloists for commencing of terminal decrepations. Application/Control Number, 09/963,472 Art Holt: 1732

<u>Perantine chime 4-5</u>. Man further teaches carbon black particles in the range of 5 - 350 and (62-20) at a concentration of 0.0 - 55%, preferribly 0.08 - 3% for pickaging plottessmalline materials (666-745). Man also teaches anticodants in the range of 0.00 - 5% (800-75). Man would have been combined with Yadip-Macre et al. for the same reasons as set forth above.

Daine 2 and 3 are rejected under 25 U.S.C. 103(s) as being unpetentable over VarileMoore et al. (US Pet 5,800,39) in view of Alea (US Pet 5,804,43) as applied to claims I and 4.6 above, and further in view of Lenasseur (US Pet 4,808,463).

Reserving claim 2-3. VarileMoore at all further tractive military and material with small production. (US C.C.)

Reparrion chies 2.3 VanObMorre et al. further teaches mixing used neterial with new/origh materials (U.SS-SE)

VanObMorre et al. does not teach moster batching. Repetiteless: Also teaches moster batching of an anticodest and pigment (numples i and SL. At the time of inventions gorgon basing performs rely in the art model from found a facility to be

pigment (examples I and S). As the time of invention a person having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to have used mester batching as taught by Ains, in the process of VasileMoure et al., since mester batching is a widely known technique for making dilute concentrations of additives in maiding materials.

Variableters et al. deue out seach antending and politicing. Montheless: Levessure extruding and politiciting (ig. 1. elements (ii) and (ii) Variableters et al. and Levessure are combinable because they are accessmed with a similar technical difficulty. areasty, recycling modeled prockets. At the terms of investion as pursue having ordinary skill in the est would have found allowing to those activated the modeling matternal in to politic, as taught by Levessure, in the process of Variableters et al. because Levessure suggests that politicities produces suppose taken the modeling dates and occurrence the recording constrain.

Claims 7 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 193(a) as being enpatentable over YanBeMoere et al. (US Pat. 5,500, 39) in view of Alao (US Pat. 5,551/43).

Reparting claims 7 and 9. VanileMearm et al. teachers the basic chaimed process of recycling used and modeled communes products (245-50 and 128-45), comprising pulsarizing /crushing the used communes product (1625-56), comprising pulsarizing /crushing the used communes product (1625-56), comprise crushed/pulsarused material as a modeling material (ile. recycling) (1635-56), and modeling recycled placese parts (1625-56).

VanDeMorre et al. does not teach adding carbon black and an anticodant to a molding material. Monetheless, Alao teaches adding carbon black and an anticoidant to a molding material (82-49 and (85-0-1825). VanDeMoere et al. and Alao are combinable became they are concerned with a simflar technical officulty, namely, modeps/packaping for photososcopine products. At the time of invention a person lowing ordinary stell in the art would have found it obvious to have added cardion black and an anticoldent to a modeling maturals, as tanglet by Alica, in the process of Yarlichkerre et al., since Alica pagests the use of carbin black as a desired pignent and the use of anticolates for convention of thermal dependence.

Claim B is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over VanDeMaere et al. (US Pat. 5.600, 39) in view of Akao (US Pat. 5.95(743) as applied to claims 7 and 9 above, and further in view of Levessour (US Pat. 4.598.463).

Beardon claims & Vaulabloare et al. does not teach activating and pelletizing. Monthelass. Levassur-activating and publishing (Fig. L elements 15 and AN. Vaulabloare et al. and Levassour are combinable because they are concerned with a similar technical difficulty, namely, recycling molded products. At the time of invention a person having architary skill in the art would have found it obvious to have activated the molding material in to pellets; as taught by Levassour, in the process of Vaulabloare et al. . because Levassour suggests that pelletizing reduces shipping costs when the molding does not occur man the recycling aperation.

Claises 13 are rejected under 25 U.S.C. (103(a) as being unputentable over VanDeldorns et al. (US Pat. 5,500, 391) in view of Alsos (US Pat. 5,55,1743) and Applicant's admitted prior art (Specification – Background section).

Recarding Calmin 13: Van DeMorer et al. teaches the basic claimed process of recycling used and mobiled consumer products (2.45-50 and 155-45), comprising pulveriting /creating the used consumer product (1.85-58), using the creative/polarized material ex a mobiling material (us. recycling) (1.85-58); and mobiling recycled plants correct (1.85-58).

Vacibilities et al diess not teach sading carbon black and an anticoldent to a multing material. More the lass: Also teaches adding carbon Shack and an anticoldent to a multiding material G2-S2 and E55-B250. Vacibilities et al and Alea are conditionable because they are conserved with a similar technical difficulty, namely, multipary functioning for photoconstitus products. At the time of invention a person being ordinary skill in the art wood love found it devious to have added carbon black and an enticoldent to a multiful material, at study by Alea, in the processor of Vacibilities et al., since Aleas outgests the one of carbon black as a desired pigment and the use of anticoldents for previous of the time of anticoldents for previous of the time of anticoldents.

You'DeMourn et al. does not teach adding rubber-like additions to the molding material. However, Applicants' admitted prior art (specification - Jackground section) between adding rubber-like additives to the molding material (se polystyrese). At the time of invention a person having or diseasy shall not not result have found it obvious to add rubber-like additives to the molding material, as teaght by applicant's admitted part, in the process of Vouldeforms et al., and would have been motivated to do so in order to make arms impact, resistant conducts.

Diam 14-15 are rejected ender SS USC (DSIs) as being unpaintable over VanDelhoere et al. (US Fas. S.500. 39) in year of Alae (US Fas. S.65(143) and Applicant's admitted prior art (Syec/fication - Background section), as applied to claim 13 shows, and further in view of Levassour (US Fas. 4.986.463).

Recording claims M-Ss. Well-blown et al. does not trach not voltage and pelletzing. Moretheless, Levaszaer extracting and pelletzing (Fig. Lebenosts 12 and M). Verill-blown et al. and Covenses are consisteable because they are concerned with a similar technical difficulty, numely, recycling melclad products. At the time all inventions a prison being ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to have extracted the modeling material in to pellets, so tungle by Levaszaev: in the process of Varibbours et al. because Levaszaev supposits that pelletzing reviews shipping cests when the modeling does not occur near the recycling operation.

Recording Chim IB: Also further teaches carbon black particles in the range of 5 – 350 nm (82-20). Also would have been combined with YanDeMeere et al. for the same reasons as set forth above.

The prior art made of recerd and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's declosure. Walsh et al., Laughner et al., Lieberman, Ressiter et al., and Nichols et al. all teach the basic state of the art

Carrespondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Easthoo, Ph D. whose telephone number is (577) 272-897. The examiner can normally be reached on Tam-Sym ESI, Monday - Fridey. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michaell Ediabami can be reached on (57) 272-486. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding in assigned is (162) 872-5206.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0081.

> Mark Eashoo, Ph.O. Primary Examiner

1/12/04

Art Unit 1732

1/12/04